

Indiana Professional Standards Board  
External Committee for School Leaders

Selections  
December 14, 2001

Members Present: John Hill (chairperson), Ed Burkhalter, Earlene Holland, Cindy Finney, Nancy Carey, Pam Frampton, Mike Horvath, Dan Grayson, Kathy Sherman, Deb Lecklider, Becky Libler, Peggy Hinckley, Steve Heck, Roger Thornton, Gary Collings (recorder)

Members Absent: Dave Kinman (facilitator), Miriam Matthews, Earl Williams, Sue Switzer, Fred Bechtold

Staff Present: Shawn Sriver, Marie Theobald

Guests Present: Brad Balch (ISU), Ed Cox (BSU), Betty Poindexter (IU), Jim Auter (Purdue)

---

The External Committee for School Leaders of the Indiana Professional Standards Board convened at 9:30 AM on December 14, 2001 at the MSD Washington Township Community and Education Center, Indianapolis.

1. Reports

1.1 Update - John Hill, chairperson, called the meeting to order and recognized Shawn Sriver for his recent appointment as Director of Licensing at IPSB. John Hill thanked Gene White for the accommodations and lunch. The selections of the September 14, 2001 meeting were accepted as presented.

1.2 Update on Recommendations for Emergency Permits - On November 28, 2001, John Hill presented to the IPSB this committee's recommendations for emergency permits for administrators excluding superintendent. He provided a copy of the summary chart, which he distributed at the IPSB meeting. The members of the IPSB decided to split the recommendations and voted by each position as follows:

Assistant or Associate Principals - passed unanimously  
Building Principals - passed (10 yes, 9 no)  
Director of Exceptional Needs - passed (18 yes, 1 no)  
Director of Career and Technical Education - passed unanimously  
Director of Curriculum and Instruction - passed unanimously  
Assistant or Associate Superintendent - passed (18 yes, 1 no)

Shawn Sriver noted that the emergency permits are expected to be effective July 1, 2004 consistent with the time period for teachers. Members discussed the IPSB debate regarding emergency permits for building principals. Steve Heck speculated that the disagreement may have been influenced by his reluctance to endorse the provision. He remarked, however, that he does not intend to pursue the issue. The Board's action is considered final with little likelihood that a board member will introduce any additional recommendations regarding emergency permits for district or building administrators.

1.3 Update on School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) Standards Setting - Shawn Sriver presented comments from Judy Miller that the validation panel sessions on October 25 - 26, 2001 went well in both recruiting and the process. There was adequate representation from all disciplines and the ETS representatives seemed impressed with the dedication of the panel participants.

ETS is changing its report format and validation process, which will delay its analysis. The panel report is now expected on or about December 21, 2001. Judy Miller recommended that the School Leaders' Committee implement the cut scores by July 1, 2002 with a compressed timeline to complete details by March. A July or August implementation date works better than mid-year dates. The challenge is the

implementation dates and the rule making process, such as timely notice to the office of the Attorney General, etc. Dr. Miller these activities to be considered:

- a subcommittee meeting with Judy Miller in January to discuss the ETS; or
- a discussion of the ETS report at this committee's next meeting on March 8; or
- a discussion of the ETS report by the IPSB at its March meeting.

Members discussed the desirability of having a subcommittee review the ETS cut-off score results and implementation dates. Members thought it might be advantageous to have a cadre of candidates take a “no-stakes” assessment from which data for Indiana could be compiled and analyzed. Members considered the option of making the SLLA scores effective in July or August 2003.

**ACTION:** John Hill asked Gary Collings to chair a subcommittee of volunteers to review the ETS scores with Judy Miller on January 11, 2002 (9:00 AM at MSD Washington Township) and present recommendations on February 8, 2002 at a special session of the School Leaders Committee. Volunteers for the subcommittee were: Pam Frampton, Cindy Finney, Betty Poindexter, Brad Balch, Earlene Holland, Jim Auter, Roger Thornton, and Steve Heck. The charge of the subcommittee is to:

- review the ETS score results;
- make a determination for a pilot period;
- set a cut score and a validation process for 2002-2003; and
- recommend an effective date of either Summer 2002 or Summer 2003;

1.4 Organizational Matters - John Hill asked for discussion on any issues regarding the organization of the School Leaders Committee. Betty Poindexter commented that university representatives are non-voting but their opinions seem valued. The importance of having representatives from all institutions which train building and district administrators was noted. Kathy Sherman observed that the ratio of building administrators may need to be increased to satisfy an adequate attendance. John Hill acknowledged the need to add this item to the agenda for the next meeting.

## 2. Continuing Education Chart

2.1 Continuing Education Point Value Chart - Shawn Sriver distributed a revised chart, which parallels the format for teachers, with revisions in the options. Shawn explained the five columns: Options, Maximum Points, Point Value, Required Verifications, and Criteria. A candidate must accrue 90 points over five years to renew a license. There are caps on the maximum number of points one can earn under the various options.

At the September meeting, members discussed the need to connect license renewal via continuing education to the original standards. Members also agreed that whatever option is addressed for continuing education purposes, it should be linked to one or more standards.

Members confirmed that the decision to grant professional experience is solely the responsibility of the Professional Growth Team, which ultimately makes a recommendation to the IPSB for license renewal. The candidate would be expected to get prior “endorsement” from his/her team leader before attending different conferences. Candidates would need to submit verification of participation to their team members. Members questioned the extent of quality control presented in the column on Criteria and how activities are to be connected to standards.

Members noted that the current requirement for sponsoring entities to submit CRU applications to the IPSB would appear to no longer be expected. Shawn Sriver commented that the sponsor, however, will need to provide a document verifying attendance or completion for the candidate to present to his/her Professional Growth Team. There may need to be some additional parameters developed for association sponsored conferences.

2.2 Continuing Education Professional Growth Plan - Shawn Sriver distributed a one page draft form carried over from the last meeting. A member suggested switching Section B (Next License) and Section C

(Current License). Another member proposed that artifacts be reflected in a candidate's professional portfolio. This form was described as a "living" document for the candidates as well as the format for submission of the Professional Growth Teams' recommendation for license renewal. An electronic format was also suggested for consideration as well as the need to incorporate the standards that were addressed by the candidate.

At the September meeting, it was suggested that the license renewal also reflect work across two or more standards. The selection of continuing education options and activities should be linked to areas of needed improvement in the Professional Growth Plan. The Professional Growth Team should determine if the candidate is addressing a balance of options across the standards.

2.3 Approval of the Chart - John Hill noted that in the future he will present the chart to the Executive Committee for its approval.

**MOTION: Becky Libler moved for approval of the Continuing Education Chart. After a second by Steve Heck, the motion was unanimously approved.**

Members agreed that it may be desirable to establish a subcommittee at the February 8 special session to outline the continuing education process, design forms, discuss expectations for association sponsored activities, etc.

### 3. Selection of Participants for Pilot II

3.1 Purpose - Although a pilot is not required, Pilot II would address the induction period including both the portfolio and mentoring aspects. The proposed focus would be on the logistical elements, such as the operation of the Professional Growth Team, and not the continuing education options. An alternative was to utilize a pilot study with a scheduled review in a year. The intended implementation date for Professional Growth Teams will likely parallel the July 1, 2004 effective date for teachers.

3.2 Selection of Participants (including Mentors) - The Pilot Study II will involve the mentoring process including the newly hired candidate and a three person mentoring team (numbers may vary). Ten newly licensed administrators will be selected by the committee in this pilot with representation as follows:

- two superintendents (including one assistant)
- one director of curriculum and instruction
- one director of exceptional needs
- one director of career and technical education
- one elementary school principal
- one middle school principal
- one high school principal
- one assistant principal
- one additional principal (any level)

Although participants are expected to be in their first year, some of the current candidates may be carried over for future consideration. At the previous meeting members endorsed Dan Grayson's request for latitude to use a director of career and vocational education with as much as three years experience.

The committee's recommendation included a request to waive Rules 46-47 renewal requirements for all individuals who successfully complete this pilot. John Hill reported that the list of volunteers to date did not cover each of the above named positions. He also suggested that Pilot II should include options of one, two, or three mentors. It may be Summer 2002 before the committee can launch Pilot II.

**MOTION: Cindy Finney moved to use a varied number of mentors in Pilot II at the discretion of the members of the university task force. After a second by Nancy Carey, the motion was unanimously approved.**

It was proposed that the committee needs to first work out the logistics before authorizing a pilot. Members asked for a review of the results from the continuing education pilot for teachers. **ACTION: At**

the February 8 special session, Judy Miller will be asked to address the “lessons learned” from the teachers’ pilot study.

#### 4. Status of Administrator-in-Resident

Marie Theobald reported that she has interviewed three (3) candidates to date but has yet to fill the Administrator-in-Residence (AIR) position. The IPSB is currently contracting with the four (4) state universities for faculty time to complete the AIR responsibilities. The following faculty representatives have been selected for the university task force: Jim Auter (Purdue), Betty Poindexter (IU), Ed Cox (BSU), Larry Gambaiani (ISU).

These faculty members are currently contacting the 33 participants plus the 10 withdrawals to assess the status of each participant's interest in continued involvement and what level of support each will need to complete his/her portfolio in the Pilot I Study. The faculty members will also be conducting regional meetings with these participants. April 15, 2002 is the deadline for submission of portfolios to ETS. Indiana is one of five States providing portfolios for this project.

Dr. Theobald confirmed that participants who complete Pilot I will receive license renewal. If the AIR position is not filled, she anticipates that the university faculty support model from Pilot I can be replicated for Pilot II. Questions to be addressed in the future are: What if a beginning administrator changes jobs in the first two years? How long is the initial two-year license valid for candidates who do not immediately go into an administrative position?

NEXT MEETING: February 8, 2002 (9:30 AM) - Special Session

LOCATION: MSD of Washington Township Community and Education Center  
(Indianapolis)

NOTE: Future Quarterly Meetings - March 8, 2002 and June 14, 2002